

DRAFT UNTIL APPROVED

Board Retreat (Friday, September 25, 2015)

Generated by Shelley R Shelton on Monday, October 5, 2015

Members present

Julie Rash, McKay Jensen, Jim Pettersson, Marsha Judkins, Michelle Kaufusi, Shannon Poulsen, Taz Murray

Staff members present

Keith Rittel, Superintendent; Stefanie Bryant, Business Administrator; Jason Cox, Executive Director of HR; Anne-Marie Harrison, Executive Director of Teaching & Learning; Alex Judd, Executive Director of Elementary Education; Chad Duncan, Technology Director; Shelley Shelton, Executive Assistant; Caleb Price, Communications & PR Coordinator; Jonathan Smith, Tech Support

Meeting called to order at 8:15 AM

A. 8:15 a.m. 9:00 Executive Session for the purpose of discussing property. Utah Code 52.4.205

C. Study Session

1. 9:00 - 10:00 I.H.S. Graduation Rate

Member McKay Jensen:

- Alternative schools in the state have higher graduation rates than Independence; 70% v. 22% at IHS. What can we do differently to raise the rate?
- Other alternative schools have changed their funding model and fund the schools as at-risk schools. They have a criteria for students that ask if graduation is possible?
- The conversation is not about the IHS effort, but about what the district is asking of IHS.
- Can funding be done differently?

I.H.S Principal Lani Quisenberry:

- We used to have students come for independent study when schools want to send students mid-term, which is disruptive and difficult for the teachers.
- There isn't good communication between PHS/THS and Independence. PHS and THS don't always communicate with IHS admin about students coming beforehand; they just give Lani a list of students coming, so IHS enrollment numbers are over.
- Sometimes counselors are not consistent in the decision making process, resulting in too many being sent to IHS.

1. Grad rate last year: 51.4%.

2. Things that are making a difference:

- Registration: each student/parent had to stop and meet with Lani and assistant principal Jacob Griffin. They would go over the new homework policy and each parent was required to sign an agreement. Reports are run each Friday; if a student is behind on homework the parent receives a ParentLink notification that the student will stay after school the following Monday to complete the homework.
- Connections class (homework): Students do packets for credit recovery.
- 9th grade class is part of the after-school class for credit.
- After School program: twice as many girls are playing volleyball; three times as many students staying after school.
- Readjustment of teachers' negative attitudes. The leadership team meets on a regular basis to determine teachers' needs. Jacob and Lani visit classes regularly to discuss Learning Targets.
- PLCs - Teachers are talking about more RTI and how to help students; they're much more positive.

Member Taz Murray: How is Lani evaluated; is it by the graduation rate?

- Lani is stressing the importance of graduation with students. Attendance of juniors and seniors is the greatest challenge.

Member McKay Jensen:

- Alpine district alternative schools started to be strained financially because every student with a behavior problem was sent to the alternative school.
- District criteria changed: no 9th graders accepted. 10th graders must have at least 4 credits; 11th graders must have at least 11 credits. Other wise they were sent to adult education or they stayed in home school.
- All graduation rates went up district-wide rather than decreasing, as principals feared.
- Students stay at Alpine alternative schools once they're enrolled; they don't return to home schools, which serves those students well in forming attachments to school community.

If we could do anything differently to raise the IHS graduation rate, what would we do? What would the process be? Would it involve all three high school principals?

Supt. Rittel wants to obtain a copy of Alpine's guidelines, develop a policy and change the culture.

- Member Jensen will get copy of Alpines guidelines to Supt. Rittel.

3. 10:10 - 10:20 a.m. Proposed Plan for Dealing with Sensitive Issues

Supt. Rittel The District needs to have a strong statement of who we are and how we treat people. This is a subset of our "kindness" initiative to raise awareness of what we say and do.

We need to take our time and do a comprehensive review that includes all areas of our school district. He shared the beginning of a draft outline, stating he wants to have a thorough yet reasonable approach, limiting the scope to begin with, dealing with one major issue at a time.

- 1) Student services: Discipline? Policies?
- 2) Curriculum: This is not about re-writing history as some states/districts do. But it is about potentially culling items that are genuinely offensive for defensible reasons.
- 3) Instruction: Are we creating a safe environment for all students in the classroom? Are we appropriately addressing classroom norms as to

how we manage discussions about sensitive issues? Do we allow students to draw their own conclusions rather than dictating them when dealing with controversial issues?

- 4) Policies: are our policies sufficiently strong and clear when dealing with matters of discrimination, sensitive issues, and so on? Do the policies guide students and adults?
- 5) PEA: can we work with PEA to solicit their support on these issues?
- 6) Professional Development: Do we have a credible and defensible process for teaching people about sensitive issues?
- 7) Hiring: Are we actively working to hire minorities? Are we choosing to consider a candidate's skills/background when dealing with minority and other issues?
- 8) Overall: Can I, as district superintendent, become as emphatic about this as I have been about pornography?

Board feedback:

- Solicit ideas/insights from people actively dealing with race or other sensitive issues.

4. 10:20 - 10:30 a.m. Proposed Plan for Consistent PLC Model

- There is a mixed approach in how PLCs are held in schools.
- Supt. Rittel wants to engage principals in a study of what other districts are doing; he will recommend having a very consistent approach.
- The struggles district-wide are a result of not having a consistent approach.
- Researcher and author of *Visible Learning* John Hattie shows a large effect size related to consistent, effective PLCs.
- Supt. Rittel is interested in having a PLC feedback form.
- Keith and staff will develop PLC guidelines for board review.
- As with any change, this will require a cultural shift.

Board feedback:

- Define why the shift is taking place and what the expected outcome is.

5. 10:30 - 11:30 Auditors' Report/Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) (attached)

Accounting Director Devyn Bryant introduced the auditors, Ed Erickson, Aaron Hickson and Sean Martin.

The business office prepares monthly board "soft close" financial statements to report the district financial status. This involves ongoing financial policy compliance reviews, reconciliations, budget variance reporting, training, and many other functions that go into the quality financial reports the board sees every month as well as timely, accurate reporting within the organization. The business office staff also prepares a "hard close" annual financial statement at year end, which is incorporated into the award-winning CAFR and is reviewed by an external CPA firm.

Hansen, Bradshaw, Malmrose and Erickson has been selected as the District's independent financial auditor to attest to the material correctness of the District financial statements. The independent audit involved examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements, assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, and evaluating the overall financial statement presentation.

The independent audit of the financial statements meet requirements according to Utah State Code 51-2 to report on compliance with significant

state fiscal laws and was part of a broader, federally mandated "Single Audit" designed to meet the special needs of federal grantor agencies. Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and the provisions of the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-133, Audits of States and Local Governments and Non-Profit Organizations, which are the authoritative standards governing Single Audit engagements. These standards require the independent auditor to report not only on the fair presentation of the financial statements, but also on the District's internal controls and compliance with legal requirements, with special emphasis on internal controls and legal requirements involving the administration of federal awards.

At the time of this writing, no management letter concerns, or items of significant concern, have been brought to the District's attention. The following finding was found worthy of bringing to the District's attention:

- Controls are in place for cash disbursements but are not being consistently followed at schools in the district - proper approval of expenditures by school administrators has not been provided
- This was a finding the prior 2 years, and the number of instances has increased

The draft CAFR and management responses to the above concerns were attached for board review. This information was reviewed by Devyn Dayley, Director of Accounting Services and Hansen, Bradshaw, Malmrose and Erickson. Time will be provided during the presentations for discussion and questions.

Ed Erickson: Significantly fewer findings than last year. Provo High and Timpview both had clean audits.

Aaron Hickson: Audit Compliance Report

- "A significant deficiency in internal control" (Controls over Cash Disbursements at Schools) is a repeat finding from last year. Controls were in place but not consistently followed by school administrators and staff. Twenty-three disbursements without documented approval by an administrator were isolated. Eleven of the 23 were at IHS; the remainder were at elementary level. No expenditures appeared to be inappropriate. District Business Office staff trained both secretaries and principals during 2015 and will again train secretaries and principals during 2016 about the requirement to have administrator prior approval to making purchases. Devyn addresses it repeatedly with principals and secretaries and will evaluate the need for elementary schools to have checking accounts.

Federal Funding: \$14,377,867

- Did not have any findings related to teachers being highly qualified. There is an extreme importance about the regulations on both school and district levels.

Sean Martin: State Funding Audit

- Finding 1: Adult Ed: 2014-15 - One adult ed. student was reported as receiving 20 hours more than could be substantiated. Recommendation was that more care be given by school personnel in taking attendance.
- Finding 2: 2014: One Adult Ed. student was awarded one level gain more than was actual. District response: Adult Education staff will make sure there is a process in place to double check the scores entered into the system to verify correct information is entered.
- Finding 3: 2014 - District's records office did not complete an online training course required for records officers.

Accounting Director Devyn Dayley reviewed the financial report.

The Final CAFR and associated audit reports will be presented to the board at the October 13 Board meeting.

Member Michelle Kaufusi arrived at 12:00 p.m.

7. 12:00 - 1:00 Adjusting the Gifted Program

Executive Director of Teaching & Learning Anne-Marie Harrison shared a PowerPoint presentation related to the district's gifted/talented program.

Gifted & Talented Programs:

- Gifted/Gifted & Talented/GTC/GATE/High Potential/High Ability
- ESEA definition: Students, children, or youth who give evidence of high achievement capability in areas such as intellectual, creative, artistic, or leadership capacity, or in specific academic fields, and who need services and activities not ordinarily provided by the school in order to fully develop those capabilities.

Current Services: Elementary School

- CAS
- PALS

Current Services: Middle School

- PUP (Provo Unlimited Progress)
- District magnet track model
- Serves about 110 7th/8th graders
- Accelerated core & differentiated math courses
- School Honors/GT Courses
- Students in Honors courses: CMS: 34%; Dixon: 40%\
- Current Services: High School
- School AP and Honors Courses
- School differentiation model
- Students in Honors courses: PHS 45%; THS: 42%
- Students in AP courses: PHS: 35%; THS: 45%
- Subjects offered in Honors/AP: PHS: English, Math, World Languages, Social Studies, Science (*Does not include distance learning of concurrent enrollment.)

Why Change?

- Lack of funding: previous use of large AP fund balance runs out this year
- Changes to state-funded busing
- State audit found PUP and CAS are ineligible bus routes
- Students lacking age-appropriate peer activity and support
- Lack of research support
- Hattie: 0.30 effect size for ability grouping for gifted

- Hattie: 0.39 effect size for enrichment
- Hattie: 0.88 effect size for acceleration
- Recent USOE study: Of 4 districts, the one that did not split students into regular 9th grade English and Honors 9th grade English had students with the highest ACT scores

Proposed Changes

Move PUP from PHS to middle schools

- Solves busing issue
- Allows students to have age-alike peers
- Allows PHS to focus on 9-12 courses and programs
- Allows middle schools to enhance GT/Accelerated services
- Mitigates PHS rebuild housing issues

Create a second CAS site

- Mitigates the impact of loss of busing
- More opportunities for more students
- An opportunity to balance a school population
- Sends one cohort to each middle school in feeder pattern
- Minimal cost

Change focus from district-based services to school/teacher-based services

- It is better to teach a man to fish than to give him a fish.
- Coaching and training in differentiation & acceleration
- Professional development from DIP: Acceleration

Issues to Consider

- Public Relations & Communication
- Changes prompted by:
 - state changing bus funding
 - loss of previous fund
 - need to utilize evidence in academic planning
- Services aren't going away; just changing
- Commitment to make programs even better
- Equity
- Making CAS accessible to qualified, low-income students (since busing is gone)
- Making sure disadvantaged students are not overlooked for testing
- Making sure PUP, Honors and AP courses represent our diverse population
- The need to weigh services for the high student with services for the low student
- Changing mindsets
- Which is better? Weekly pull-out class or daily differentiation?

- Technology for differentiation/remediation/acceleration/individualization
- Reliance on research evidence
- USOE finding: more students need the rigor that comes from acceleration.

Questions/feedback:

What is the timeline?

- Phase the PUP change so current 7th graders would go to middle school next year. Need to let parents know as soon as possible of the change.
- When asked, board members were instructed to say there's a plan in place and we'll know more in a couple of months.
- Anne-Marie is anticipating the parent letter will be ready to send by January.
- Define/communicate the difference between "honors" and "accelerated."
- Invite middle school principals to Feb. retreat to discuss.

8. 1:00 - 1:15 Master Board Training Discussion

Discussion took place regarding board members logging into the USBA Powerup site to complete the Master Board training, specifically the open meeting law training, no later than Dec. 1, 2015. Supt. Rittel will check with USBA Executive Director Richard Stowell about the possibility of him coming to do a superintendent/business administrator/board self evaluation training after the first of the year.

9. 1:15 - 2:15 PHS

Superintendent Rittel indicated the following:

- After reviewing the file on the district's acquisition of the west side property, he learned that contrary to what we had been previously told, the land was purchased by the district rather than donated for the specific purpose of building a high school. When land is purchased, the owner(s) may use it at their discretion within the zoning restrictions of land and mineral rights. There *was* a donation, however, so the owners could get a tax write off that year, of two smaller parcels totaling approximately 10 acres .
- One of the state laws regarding the surplus of real property defines the eligible entity as the City (see below). Also, the population density must be 3,000 residents per square mile. In Provo, the population density is approximately 2,750 per square mile. Therefore, the district is not legally obligated to first offer to surplus the property to the City. The Board would need to determine if they wanted to extend that offer based on the partnership with the City rather than from a legal standpoint. If the Board makes a decision to surplus the property, Supt. Rittel recommended legal counsel be included in that conversation and manage the process from that point forward.

- Mayor Curtis had contacted Supt. Rittel and asked if the Board was committed to the prospective buyer of the PHS site and if the Board would object to the City exercising the right to purchase it. The City's motivation would be a mutual interest with the District in placing a commercial business on the site that would generate tax revenue for both the City and District. Any profit the City realized from selling the property to a commercial entity would have to be shared with the District.
- Factors to consider would include a) Whether the City would match the terms already agreed to by the current prospective buyer, b) the timeline of the city being able to make the purchase, i.e., having to go out for a bond in the November election, and c) the purchase from the current prospective buyer would be a cash deal, eliminating the need to wait for funding.

Effective 5/12/2015

Utah Code 53A-2-402. Definitions.

As used in this part:

(1) "Eligible entity" means:

- (a) a city or town with a population density of 3,000 or more people per square mile; or
- (b) a county whose unincorporated area includes a qualifying planning advisory area.

(2) "Purchase price" means the greater of:

- (a) an amount that is the average of:
 - (i) the appraised value of the surplus property, based on the predominant zone in the surrounding area, as indicated in an appraisal obtained by the eligible entity; and
 - (ii) the appraised value of the surplus property, based on the predominant zone in the surrounding area, as indicated in an appraisal obtained by the school district; and
- (b) the amount the school district paid to acquire the surplus property.

(3) "Qualifying planning advisory area" means a planning advisory area under Section [17-27a-306](#) that has a population density of 3,000 or more people per square mile within the boundaries of the planning advisory area.

(4) "Surplus property" means land owned by a school district that:

- (a) was purchased with taxpayer money;
- (b) is located within a city or town that is an eligible entity or within a qualifying planning advisory area;

(c) consists of one contiguous tract at least three acres in size; and

(d) has been declared by the school district to be surplus.

Facilities Director Mark Wheeler reviewed what was currently involved in investigating the Lakeshore Drive property:

Geotech and Structural Engineering

- Geotech engineers scheduled drilling tests for specific points on the site in relation to potential placement of the buildings
- The soils investigation will confirm existing conditions in preparation for review by the structural engineers
- Structural engineers will determine potential design criteria for seismic events, building loads in relation to soils conditions, etc.

Civil Engineering

- Grading model, including soils cut & fill projections
- Storm water drainage volumes and pipe alignments which will require some calculations and drafting
- Water and sewer utility points of connection, capacities, and alignments
- Water flow research to confirm available fire flow to that area

Traffic Impact Study

- Traffic engineers started an impact study for the University Campus
- They will complete that study and then start to review how existing campus impact could translate to the west side parcel

Provo City Engineering Coordination

- The architectural & engineering team has already met with all Provo City Engineering Dept Directors
- Coordination will almost be daily as we carefully review the gathered data
- City Power Dept. already confirmed close proximity of fiber optic and power along Lakeshore Drive

Schedule

- Geotech will need until the end of first week of October to share findings
- Structural Engineers will need at least 1 week to study geotech details
- Civil Engineers will need until around October 15 to complete their portion of the work
- To prepare cost estimates for Board review of potential Impact....our Design & Construction team will need until the first week of November to provide reliable estimates
- Updates will be shared with Board of any significant findings on a consistent basis in case something is determined to be high risk.

Additional related comments:

- The Lakeshore Drive Impact Study will be sent to members of the Facilities Advisory Committee for review and attached to BoardDocs.
- Mark will keep board members updated as the process continues.
- Supt. Rittel recommended Board members continue to exercise caution when discussing the PHS sale/relocation issue with patrons since the Board is still in the fact-finding phase.
- 99% of the design/programming already done for the three-story academic wing would be shifted to the new site if needed.
- Regardless of what happens with the site decision, the Board will need to determine what they're comfortable with regarding a budget for the school.
- Mark is still waiting for appraisals on the PHS site.

Elementary construction summary:

- *Edgemont & Provost*: The Statement of Interest & Qualifications (SOIQ) for architectural services will be posted within a week. That will be at least a 30-day process. It is hopeful an architect will be in place by the end of October. From that point on, Nov/Dec through early April will be the design timeline, with plans released toward the end of April for bidding. The projects will be awarded in May; construction will begin in June on both sites. Even though both are custom sites, architects are very interested in both projects and all have templates that could be used for plans.

The Provost property was originally purchased with one-time federal funding. It was meant to keep some open space for recreational use by the community. It causes some challenges to building on the north side park and flip properties with the City because we would have to go through that federal agency for approval. The City is willing to be of assistance to the District, but they would have to propose another open space or park within city limits that's comparable in size and value that's not already planned. Timing is critical; the City is awaiting direction from the District since making a property flip would be very time consuming and could negatively impact the construction timeline. The size of

the city park adjacent to Provost is very close in size to the Provost site; Mark will get the actual dimensions.

Should the District not do a property swap with the City, construction options would include a two-story portion, which would fit nicely on the current site.

Board members will submit names of prospective construction committee members to Mark. Member Taz Murray will serve on the Edgemont construction committee; Member Poulsen will serve on the Provost committee.

Logan High School Project Comparison:

- Mark shared details of the current Logan High School construction project, pointing out advantages they have, including six additional acres than the PHS site that includes the new Logan Recreation Center. The new main high school gym and athletic facilities are in the recreation center. The older existing gym and auditorium are being renovated. They don't have issues with temporary parking because of the school's residential location.
- The bond budget was \$35 million. The budget is now at \$43 million due to additions to enhance the building, a 22% increase from the original bond budget.
- 200,00 square feet are being renovated, including seismic upgrades, some from 1968 and some from 1992; 120,000 square feet is new construction.
- The three-year timeline is similar to the PHS timeline.
- All "shop" programs have been shifted to Bridgerland Applied Technology, eliminating that need for space within the school.

President Julie Rash was excused at 2:15 p.m.

Supt. Rittel stated the following:

While recently conducting some research, he discovered that early on in the construction process, Facilities Director Mark Wheeler and one of the architect advisors had been told (by a former district employee) to design the new Provo High for a maximum of 1700 students. At the time that directive was issued by the individual, the PHS student enrollment was already approximately 1,750. Being told to design for no more than 1700 confused the architects as far as what square footage they were building for. One of the things Mark wanted to do before the extensive planning phase during the bond was to have funds set aside to have architects go through Provo High with a "fine-tooth comb" so they could say what the construction is going to cost with greater accuracy. That said, it's important to note that there is nothing legally restricting the district from paying

the bond amount for a building and spending additional money from the fund balance if the need exists.

10. Motion to Adjourn

I move we adjourn the study session.

Motion by Marsha Judkins, second by Michelle Kaufusi.

Final Resolution: Motion Carries

Aye: McKay Jensen, Jim Pettersson, Marsha Judkins, Shannon Poulsen, Taz Murray

Not present at vote: Julie Rash

The study session was adjourned at 2:20 p.m.